

III. REMARKS

1. Claims 1, 14, 20 and 22 are amended. Claims 24-26 are new. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication of the allowability of claims 10-13.

2. Claims 1-5, 14-20 and 22 are not unpatentable over Lang et al. ("Lang") in view of Meyerzon et al. ("Meyerzon") under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Applicants' invention, as recited in claim 1, retrieves at least one credibility rating associated with an online id and associates that credibility rating with the document in order to provide the document with a credibility rating. This is not disclosed or suggested by the combination of Lang in view of Meyerzon. Lang deals with extracting informons from a data stream. The raw informons can be credibility filtered according to a credibility profile (Col. 6, line 59 to Col. 7, line 25). This is not the same as what is being claimed by Applicants. In Lang, any credibility rating must already be in the data stream in order for the credibility filter 35 to filter the raw informons 19 according to a credibility profile. In Applicants' invention the online id associated with the document is first determined. Then, the credibility rating system retrieves a credibility rating associated with the online id. The credibility rating associated with the online id is related to the document so the user can see the credibility rating of the document. These features of Applicants' invention are not disclosed or suggested by Lang.

Meyerzon does not overcome the deficiencies of Lang. Meyerzon is directed to processing data obtained from documents (See Abstract). If the document includes meta-tags, an "Author" meta-

tag can be analyzed to identify the author of the document (Col. 3, lines 1-9). Thus, the document must already include the information. Meyerzon does not disclose or suggest retrieving or determining a credibility rating associated with the online id as is claimed by Applicants. In fact, Meyerzon is not even related to determining a credibility rating for an online id or a document. Thus, Lang in view of Meyerzon does not disclose or suggest each feature of Applicants' invention as recited in claim 1 and claim 1 should be allowable.

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the reference itself or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or combine reference teachings. There must also be a reasonable expectation of success, and the reference(s), when combined, must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. (See M.P.E.P. §2142). As noted above, Lang in view of Meyerzon does not disclose or suggest each feature of Applicants' invention as claimed. Thus, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be established.

Furthermore, Applicants also submit that there is no suggestion or motivation to modify the references as proposed by the Examiner. The Examiner's proposition that Applicants' invention would be obvious as recited in the claims is not supported by the factual contents of Lang in view of Meyerzon. The reference itself and/or the knowledge generally available to one of skill in the art does not provide the requisite motivation or suggestion to modify the reference as proposed for purposes of 35 U.S.C. §103(a). When "the PTO asserts that there is an explicit or implicit teaching or suggestion in the prior art, it must

indicate where such a teaching or suggestion appears in the reference". In re Rijckaert, 28 USPQ2d 1955, 1957 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The Examiner is requested to provide an indication as to where any such teaching, suggestion or motivation appears in the reference. The Examiner indicates that the motivation to combine the references would be to be able to retrieve the contents of documents from the web pages. This is clearly not the purpose or scope of Applicants' invention. Applicants' invention is directed to associating a credibility rating with a document. Lang in view of Meyerzon does not teach this. Absent such a teaching, it is submitted that a *prima facie* case of obviousness over Lang in view of Meyerzon under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is not established.

Therefore, in light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 should be allowable. Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1 and should also be allowable at least in view of the dependencies.

3. Claim 14 is also not unpatentable over Lang in view of Meyerzon. Claim 14 recites "retrieving at least one credibility rating associated with the online id from a credibility rating system." This is not disclosed or suggested by Lang in view of Meyerzon. As noted above, Lang only extracts data from a data stream. Although the data can include an author's identity, there is nothing in Lang to suggest that Lang's invention can then use the author's identity to search for and retrieve a credibility rating associated with the author's identity. Meyerzon is also limited to extracting data from, for example, an author meta-tag. There is also nothing in Meyerzon to suggest that a credibility rating is determined and/or associated with

the author meta-tag. Thus, the combination of Lang and Meyerzon is also deficient with respect to at least this feature.

Furthermore, the combination of Lang in view of Meyerzon does not disclose or suggest that a credibility rating retrieved for the online id is associated with a document as recited in claim 14. Applicants' invention first determines the online id associated with the document, retrieves a credibility rating for the online id from a credibility rating system, and associates the credibility rating with the document. The combination of Lang in view of Meyerzon does not disclose or suggest each of these claimed features. Thus, claim 14 should also be allowable. Claims 15, 16, 17, 18 and 19 depend from claim 14 and should also be allowable at least in view of the dependencies.

Claims 20-23 should be allowable for the reasons stated above.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record, and are in proper form for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

A check in the amount of \$54.00 is enclosed for additional claim fees. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment for any fees associated with this communication or credit any over payment to Deposit Account No. 16-1350.

Respectfully submitted,

Geza S. Ziegler, Jr.
Reg. No. 44,004

1 July 2003
Date

Perman & Green, LLP
425 Post Road
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 259-1800 Ext. 134
Customer No.: 2512

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date indicated below as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date: 7/1/03

Signature: D. Boland
Person Making Deposit